2147

Liberty

NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER — PROUDHON

Vol. XI.—No. 18. NEW YORK, N. Y., JANUARY 11, 1896. Whole No. 330.

"For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!
Shines that high light whereby the world is saved;
And though thou slay us, we will trust in thee."

JOHN HAY.

On Picket Duty.

Comrade Cohen has experienced many delays in his issue of "Mutual Banking," but he expects to have it ready soon.

Here is a straw indicative of progress. The earlier readers of Liberty may remember that I offered the paper at the beginning to the Boston Public Library for its reading-room, but, upon the refusal of the managers to place it there for public use, I withdrew my offer, their willingness to preserve the paper in their "Inferno" not suiting my purpose. A few days ago I received from the librarian of the Columbia College library, which is a library not for the college simply, but for the people of New York, a letter reading as follows: "At what price could you furnish this library with a complete set of your periodical, Liberty? We should be glad to put it into the library, if it can be obtained at reasonable terms." The stone which the builders rejected is not yet the head of the corner, but it is getting there all the same.

No city is more notorious for its boodle aldermen than Chicago. Men of ability will not serve, because there is little pay and less distinction in such offices, and so the choice is restricted to those who are attracted by the prospect of boodle. Prominent business men of the city suggest that the only solution of the difficulty lies in the election of "poor but honest" *bourgeois*, who, for two thousand dollars a year, would render the city faithful service. Assuming that these folks would remain honest in spite of temptations and opportunities, what about the question of ability? In these days of municipalization and agitation for larger public control, city fathers are perpetually called upon to deal with matters of the greatest complexity. If they are ignorant, there are plenty of hired lobbyists around to humbug them and procure their consent to all sorts of wasteful and corrupt schemes. Honest ignoramuses would doubtless cost the taxpayers more than smart rascals. True, at present the average city father is as ignorant as he is corrupt, but it is wise to abandon all dreams of utopian improvement. What is most provoking is the blindness of those who continue to prate about "municipal Socialism."

The two novels which competent literary critics pronounce the most powerful and masterly published last year are condemned by the prudes and Philistines as immoral to the last degree. Both Hardy, in "Jude the Obscure," and Meredith, in "An Amazing Marriage," deal with the sex and marriage problem, and in a way extremely distasteful to the worshippers of the legal bond. The editor of the "Critic" says it would be a consolation to have Meredith declared insane, while Hardy has so scandalized her by his social departure and apparent conversion to radicalism that she grows incoherent in her abuse of him. It seems that nobody is left to the old maids and young persons except Mrs. Ward, Anthony Hope, and Ian Maclaren. The radicals are glad to welcome Meredith and Hardy, and thank the prudes for excommunicating them. Meredith's new novel is admitted, even by unfriendly critics with some regard for truth and art, to be in his best style, while Hardy's work is praised for rare spiritual beauty, tragic intensity, sad and fine irony, vivid realism, and intellectual strength.

What a characteristic situation we have in our governmental affairs at present! One branch of congress enacts, in the greatest possible haste, two pieces of "emergency" legislation (a tariff bill and a bond bill), in response to demands of the president; but, strangely enough, the "response" is of a character which the president repudiates with indignation and contempt. He insists on one kind of immediate relief, and the house hastens to give him something which, in his opinion, is no relief at all. The other branch of congress, in addition to having notions of its own, which agree neither with those of the house or with those of the president, absolutely refuses to heed the appeals for help, but in its own leisurely fashion proposes to evolve something, after months of idle talk, which will stand no chance of becoming law. Meantime "remedies" will be applied which are distasteful to everybody, and for which the taxpayers have to settle. The salaries of all the "governing" people go on, however. Isn't government worse than useless, so far as the present situation is concerned? Even the most practical citizen is ready to admit this, but the trouble with him is that, owing to his ignorance of "theory," he fails to perceive that the mischiefs which are creating all these troubles are the direct outcome of governmental management.

The London "Freethinker" is very anxious that opponents of marriage should consider the interests of third persons before entering into love relations. As a rule, however, the only way to make "third persons" happy at present is to sacrifice the happiness of the lovers themselves. Christian ethics may demand this, but on what rational grounds can such an absurd course be defended? As for that other class of "third persons," the children, whose interests are alleged by the "Freethinker" to be best promoted by marriage, the editor certainly fails to show, even from his own point of view, that the children of free lovers are likely to receive less care than the children legally begotten. The notion that marriage converts into tender and loving fathers and mothers those who would otherwise neglect and maltreat their offspring is a queer superstition. The whole marriage question with advanced people to-day is one of balance between desires, and each free-lover has to decide for himself whether he can "afford" not to make war openly upon marriage. The notion of Mr. Foote that all advanced lovers are bound to marry is as absurd as the notion that all advanced lovers are bound to defy the marriage laws publicly at all hazards. It is natural for a man to try to live in accordance with his convictions, but it is not always the most enjoyable course. How far an individual will go depends upon his circumstances, environment, and temperament, and the intensity of his desire of freedom for himself and for the woman he loves.

Charles Dudley Warner thinks that the time has come for believers in marriage to challenge the confident assertions of revolutionists that that ancient and honorable institution is a failure. He appeals to the "sound part of society," and particularly to the wives. A *plébiscite* of wives might settle the question. The ballot, "happy" or "unhappy," together with a brief statement of the causes of unhappiness, and an answer to the question whether, if unhappy, a change is desirable, would cover every material point. It would certainly be an interesting experiment, but Mr. Warner overlooks the importance of a preliminary "campaign of education" (and not a short one, either). If we are to have an intelligent vote, the issues must be clearly and fully presented, and all sides must have a hearing. The daily, weekly, and monthly press should open its pages to a frank canvass of the subject. The ballot, too, should be a secret one. Few are sincere on the question of marital happiness, and no wife would (except in extreme cases) let her neighbors know of her unhappiness. It is difficult to obtain light on the subject, owing to shame, fear of ostracism, aversion to notoriety, prejudice, hypocrisy, and kindred feelings. A secret ballot might reveal a state of things that would startle the conservatives and easy-going philosophers who confound appearances with actualities.

Liberty.

Issued Fortnightly at Two Dollars a Year; Single Copies, Eight Cents.

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Editor and Publisher

Office of Publication, 24 Gold Street.

Post Office Address: Liberty, P. O. Box No. 1312, New York, N. Y.

Entered at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

NEW YORK, N. Y., JANUARY 11, 1896

"In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at one stroke the sword of the executioner, the seal of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the gauge of the excise man, the erasing-knife of the department clerk, all those insignia of Politics, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel." — Proudhon.

☞ The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Where Did Flower Find Him?

A new species of "philosophical Anarchist" has been discovered by the "Arena." It is not a species which is fit to survive, and in the intellectual struggle for existence it is doomed to disappear. A writer who signs himself Charles Clark Rodolf, M. D., writes in the "Arena" on the "Unrighteousness of Government, as Viewed by a Philosophical Anarchist," and the editor bespeaks attention for the article. As nobody seems to know who Mr. Rodolf is, it is interesting to examine his credentials.

It may be well to begin by stating at the outset the conclusion to which a logical reader of the "Arena" article is bound to arrive, and adduce the proof afterwards. Though Mr. Rodolf has obviously heard and read something about philosophical Anarchism, he has failed to grasp the essential principle, and is self-contradictory, unscientific, and misleading. He does not adhere to his own definitions, and every page contains evidence of the woful confusion in his mind.

Passing over a number of preliminary remarks of an indifferent character, we come to the paragraph purporting to give the true definition and test of Anarchism. Mr. Rodolf says:

> The true Anarchist, who may be styled the philosophical Anarchist, believes that all human government is usurpation, tyranny, essentially wrong, an unjustifiable interference with individual liberty; that in the ideal society every person may freely do whatsoever he will, right or wrong, his own conscience and his desire for the love of others being the only restraining influences. A man's opinions, not his acts, are the basis of his title to the name Anarchist. The methods he advocates and employs to promote his ideal neither weaken nor strengthen his title. He may believe in popular education, and may favor and practise agitation through speaking and writing. He may advocate the immediate forcible overthrow of existing government, and may join the Nihilists in a dynamite campaign. He may feel that time only can accomplish the work, and all effort on his part would avail little, and he may do nothing to bring about what he considers the ideal state of society. Any of the foregoing he may do and remain a true Anarchist. The test of the philosophical Anarchist is a belief that all human government is adverse to the peace and happiness of mankind, utterly incompatible with a high degree of individual and social development, an assumption of authority for which there is no basis of right.

The meaning of these sentences seems plain. Opinions, we are told, and not acts or methods, are the test, the title. In the very next paragraph this is completely forgotten, and statements are made which carry diametrically opposite implications. Speaking of the tendency to confound mere lawlessness and criminal conduct with Anarchism, Mr. Rodolf observes that it is no honor to philosophical Anarchists to be counted among those "who may not inaptly be styled criminal Anarchists," and goes on to say:

> A man's acts determine whether or not he is entitled to be ranked with criminal Anarchists. His opinions are of no consequence. A criminal Anarchist is a person who boldly, openly, and flagrantly sets at defiance existing laws or encourages others to do so. It is immaterial whether the law is good or bad. Law is law; and whoever persistently sets at defiance a law promulgated by the supreme power of a State or municipality is a criminal Anarchist. This by no means implies that every murderer and thief is a criminal Anarchist. It is not enough that the act is unlawful and persistent. There must be an autocratic display of contempt and disregard for authority and public opinion calculated to promote in others a like contempt and disregard and to result, if continued, in a chaotic state of society. . . . It will thus be seen that the criminal Anarchist is the logical opposite of the philosophical Anarchist. For, while ready to trample under foot every law which might prevent the accomplishment of his personal ends, the criminal Anarchist is the first man to resort to law when it will serve his purpose. His contempt is not for law, but for his fellow men; and he does not mean that law or public opinion shall defeat his selfish schemes. This is in striking contrast with the declaration of the philosophical Anarchist that all law, good or bad, is equally an unrighteous interference with personal liberty.

Can there be a more direct, glaring, and amusing contradiction than that which is found between these two extracts? First we are informed that a man may advocate violence and organize dynamite campaigns without losing his title to philosophical Anarchism; in the same breath almost, the assertion is made that "law is law, and whoever," etc., "is a criminal Anarchist." True, something vague is added about contempt for public opinion and the readiness to resort to law for personal ends to distinguish a criminal anarchist from a philosophical one; but this does not improve matters at all, for we are distinctly told that opinions are of no consequence, and that acts alone determine whether a man is a criminal anarchist. A man who defies any law, then, good or bad, no matter what his opinion may be, is a criminal anarchist, according to this test. Yet, under the test first given, the man who has certain opinions about law is a philosophical Anarchist, no matter what his acts are and what his attitude toward law, government, and public opinion may be. To make confusion worse confounded, Mr. Rodolf adds that John Hancock, Patrick Henry, Paine, and Washington were "criminal anarchists," because they boldly defied bad laws. But they certainly do not answer to the description of criminal anarchists; they do not satisfy the conditions of the alleged test. They did not display contempt for public opinion in the sense in which monopolists are said to do so, and they did not resort to law for personal ends. How, then, can they be classed with criminal anarchists, except on my supposition that the features of "personal ends" and "contempt for public opinion" are really foreign to the test contemplated by Mr. Rodolf himself. (It is needless to point out that they cannot be described as philosophical Anarchists, either, since they do not satisfy the first test—utter disbelief in all law and government.)

While dwelling on the contradictions and confusion disclosed in the above quotations, we must not overlook the misconception of the true position of the Anarchist residing in the statement that "in the ideal society every person may freely do whatsoever he will, right or wrong," without any interference from others. This, of course, points, not to a *régime* of equal freedom, but to the Tolstoi ideal of non-resistance, to so-called Christian Anarchy. There is further evidence of Mr. Rodolf's Tolstoian proclivities in the following passages:

> None but an Anarchist can appreciate true Christianity, and no true Anarchist can long deny the teachings of the meek and lowly Anarchist of Palestine. . . . Most self-styled philosophical Anarchists think wrong should be prohibited. So do czar, sultan, and emperor. No despot ever attempted to prevent anything but wrong, as he saw it; and monarchs have as much right to their opinions as have Anarchists. Human prohibition of wrong calls for a human standard of right, and a human judgment to compare the act with the standard. This opens the door to every abuse.

This is apparently conclusive. Any attempt to enforce equality of freedom, to punish or restrain aggression, would set up a human standard, and would therefore be un-Anarchistic. According to Mr. Rodolf, then, only a non-resistant can be a philosophical Anarchist, while those of us who believe in organizations for the protection of life, equal liberty, etc., are only sham, self-styled Anarchists.

Now, it is not my intention to attempt to reason with Mr. Rodolf and defend our right to the title we bear. A man so confused is past "human standards" of logical aid. But he may again be reminded that his first test of philosophical Anarchists conflicts with this excommunication of all but non-resistants. He plainly stated that a philosophical Anarchist may be a dynamiter and revolutionist, and certainly a non-resistant can be neither. But, if resistance to existing governments is not inconsistent with philosophical Anarchism, why is resistance to other aggressors—in other words, *enforcement* of equal liberty—declared to be contrary to the spirit of genuine Anarchism? It is useless to ask for a reconciliation of these contradictions. The mind responsible for them must be impervious to scientific reasoning.

No one will be surprised to learn, after the foregoing, that Mr. Rodolf is a Communist, but it certainly will surprise everybody to hear that on this point of Communism the article does not contradict itself. It is pure accident, no doubt, but the fact must be admitted. Mr. Rodolf says:

> Men will think them necessary so long as the accumulation of private property is the chief business of life. The accumulation of private property will be the chief business of life so long as the total production of wealth is insufficient to supply abundantly all the real and imaginary needs of every one and still leave a surplus so great as to remove every fear of material want. . . .
>
> Those who desire the beautiful Anarchy of Chris-

tianity, who wish to see God's will done on earth as it is in heaven, can in no better way show their sincerity than by helping to gain for every one free access to the bounties of nature, and by promoting the establishment of an industrial brotherhood among men. When the present commercial cannibalism is replaced by a system of coöperative production and distribution, it will be possible, without great effort on the part of any one, to fill the world with an abundance that shall laugh at want. When no one suffers from lack of means to supply his material wants, no one will care for laws to assist him to rob his neighbor or to prevent his neighbor from robbing him. Then none will be cursed by their own avarice, and frugality will not be esteemed a virtue. When there is no temptation to lay up treasures on earth, it will be easy to teach men to seek to lay up treasures in heaven.

Not only is there to be no private property under Anarchy, according to Mr. Rodolf, but it seems that the disappearance of private property, through coöperative production and communistic consumption, is an essential condition of Anarchy. Government is caused by private property, and can be put away only when the temptation to lay up treasures on earth has ceased to operate. By what means Communism is to be brought about, Mr. Rodolf omits to state. Ten to one he would favor governmental measures looking to that end. It would be no more inconsistent for him to accept compulsion as a method of realizing Communism than it is to denounce punishment of aggression in the name of Anarchy.

I have commented only on the major points of the article. The minor inconsistencies and absurdities are too numerous for criticism, even if it were worth while to deal with them, which, fortunately, is not the case. V. Y.

Voluntary Co-operation.

In enumerating the obstacles that political economy encounters, Prof. F. A. Walker says that one of them "arises from the use of terms derived from the vocabulary of every-day life . . . with some of which are associated in the popular mind conceptions inconsistent with, or, at times, perhaps, antagonistic to, those which are in the view of the writer on economics." A striking example of this is found in the use of the word coöperation. This word has come to be popularly understood as implying some form of copartnership. Strictly speaking, of course, it means only "working-together"; and, when Spencer speaks of voluntary coöperation being a characteristic of industrialism, I take it that he uses the word in this, its broadest sense. The wool-grower, the spinner, the weaver, the tailor, all work together to produce a suit of clothes,—that is, they coöperate, though there may be no kind of communistic arrangement between them. Perhaps "the somewhat unsatisfactory term, division of labor," expresses the idea more clearly in many respects. It is in this sense that Anarchists often use the word, but, owing to the popular conception of its meaning, our position on many important questions is misunderstood.

Under free conditions there would, in most cases, be no necessity for coöperation as usually understood. In fact, such an arrangement would often prove to be more of a curse than a blessing. To make this clear, let us take an example. Suppose several men, realizing that goods can be bought cheaper in large quantities, agree to buy their groceries together and divide them among themselves. They will find that they effect a saving by this arrangement. But they have really performed so much extra labor, and the pay for that labor is all they have saved. They have performed the services of one middleman and so save his profit. As they go into the business more extensively, this becomes more apparent. They will soon find that a great amount of time and labor is requisite, if they would keep informed of the state of the market,—the price and the quality of the various commodities. So great will this soon become that it will more than counterbalance any saving they may effect. It is absurd to suppose that several men, engaged in other callings, can perform the functions of the retailer in any line as well as men who devote their whole time to that business. To obviate this difficulty, the coöperators must either give up their scheme, or else employ a competent manager to take care of the business. That it will pay them to employ the most efficient manager they can obtain is obvious. But such a man will demand the highest wages he can get. In the absence of rent and interest, his wages will necessarily be just what he could get by conducting such a business for himself. So, after paying the salary of the manager, the goods will cost the consumers as much as if they had bought from a retailer in the first place. In addition to this, they will have all the trouble of looking after the manager for nothing. The ordinary retailer's wages depend upon the success with which he conducts his business, but the salary of the manager of a co-operative concern is not dependent upon the results of his efforts in anything like the same degree.

These two conceptions of the term coöperation are antagonistic to a very great extent, for the popular conception is really a denial of the division of labor. When a man does a little carpenter-work for himself, he thinks he saves the amount he would otherwise have paid a carpenter. In reality he has merely earned the carpenter's wages. But, as he is probably a poor carpenter, it will take him longer to do the work than it would a good mechanic. So he will be earning lower wages. It would be better for him to devote the same amount of time and labor to his ordinary occupation and, out of the money so earned, pay a carpenter to do the work for him. The same is true in regard to the retailer.

These considerations, however, may be modified by circumstances. It may be a pleasure, for example, for a bookkeeper to do a little wood-work in the evening. Or it may be that the conditions of a man's business are such that the time spent in this kind of work could not be profitably employed at his usual occupation. But these factors in no way invalidate the tenor of my argument. They apply only in isolated cases, and disappear as soon as the co-operative associations are organized.

In the present day, of course, the retailer collects rent and interest in addition to his wages. So there is a direct saving in such co-operation when conducted on a small scale. But, as soon as a regular business is established, the rent and interest have to be paid in one form or another, and so the benefits are neutralized as soon as they promise to become of any importance.

To conduct such enterprises, it is necessary that all the coöperators form an agreement. Such an agreement will often prove a hindrance to the individual members, if they should wish to act at variance with the policy of the association. No matter how liberal the contract might be, it would necessarily curtail the liberty of the members more than if no such organization existed, and each were free to purchase his goods when, where, and how he liked, without reference to the wishes of any of the rest of the community. We have already seen that there would be no economic advantages to offset this restriction of liberty; so such associations would be a positive detriment to those concerned.

Some few instances might be found where, from the nature of some special business, it could be conducted more economically upon such a coöperative plan.

But such instances are very few. I apprehend that even Mutual Banks and Protective Associations will, in the end, be conducted by individuals, who will cater to the wants of their customers and make what wages they can out of the business, rather than by communistic associations of the customers. F. D. T.

Hysteria or Sanity?

Under the heading, "National Hysteria," Mr. Yarros sends me the following protest against my editorial, "Dark Days," which appeared in the last issue:

Every reader of Liberty must agree with the view, expressed by Mr. Tucker, that anything is preferable to a duplication in the western hemisphere of the militancy prevailing in the eastern, but I venture to doubt whether any reader will agree with him that the alleged aggressions of Great Britain in Venezuela threaten us with the evils indicated. It is strange that Mr. Tucker should be the only reformer, cool-headed radical, and lover of peace who, in the event of England's refusal to abide by the preposterous and childish decision of Grover Cleveland, would welcome "a sharp and decisive war" with her. (1) So far as I know *all* the progressive newspapers and thinkers and reformers in the country (with the sole exception of Mr. Tucker, I repeat) either denounce or ridicule the attempt of a discredited administration to inspire fear and arouse antagonism by the pretence that the British attitude in any way menaces the safety and welfare of the United States. (2) England is the most industrial country in the world, and, if she really succeeded in annexing every port of South and Central America, the United States would have every reason to welcome the arrangement. (3) But, however that may be, England is not trying to grab anything now, and there is no question of "extension" involved. She is claiming certain territory under a title which is certainly as good, so far as the world at large is concerned, as that of Venezuela. Who the real owner is we do not know, and, unless arbitration is agreed upon, it will be impossible to determine the question. There is certainly more reason for believing that England is honest in her claim than for believing that Venezuela is honest. (4) If she is unwilling to submit the entire dispute to arbitration, it is manifestly because no other nation (least of all the United States) would, under exactly similar circumstances, do what she is now urged to do. (5) International arbitration is an excellent thing, but it is not as yet an established institution, and England cannot reasonably be expected to act upon other than accepted and established principles. (6) No self-respecting nation would submit to what Prof. Theodore S. Woolsey, of Yale, the greatest American writer on international law, has justly called the "dictatorial" demands of Cleveland's message. (7).

Of course the United States can go to war for any reason or no reason at all, but the progressive elements of the country would hardly applaud a war for politics only. So far as this threatened war is concerned, it is, emphatically, one for politics and buncombe

only. (8). The United States is not menaced in the least. The Olney argument of an American balance of power, the danger of an "entering wedge," etc., is grotesquely absurd. Whether a given step is a menace or not is a question of fact. Considering the extent and importance of English present possessions in America, the "extension" of her territory in Venezuela cannot rationally be said to threaten the United States with the burdens of standing armies and huge taxation. (9) It is simply idiotic to pretend that what Canada has *not* rendered necessary, the recognition of the Schomaburgk line in Venezuela *will* inevitably entail. (10) All imaginable considerations, geographical, political, industrial, and military, are generally declared by sober people to be irreconcilably at war with such a pretence.

Were it necessary to discuss the Cleveland attitude in the light of the Monroe doctrine, it could easily be shown that neither its letter or spirit justifies interference with England's course. Fortunately all responsible writers and teachers have already condemned this attempt to distort and stretch the Monroe doctrine. But radicals care nothing about Monroe's doctrine or Olney's doctrine. The only point for them to consider is whether self-defence (in a broad sense) requires the United States to resist England. It seems to me that there can be none but a negative answer from any standpoint that is not jingoistic. Had the United States allowed England to maintain the *status quo*, there would now be no danger whatever of militarism or any of its concomitant evils. (11) But the United States is a nation of jingoes, and they gladly welcomed the pretext invented by Olney. Happily the progressive minority, led by the decent portion of the press and such men as Dr. Lyman Abbott, President Eliot, Professor Woolsey, Henry George, Ernest H. Crosby, and the members of the Boston Free Trade League, are trying to arrest the progress of national hysteria and barbarism. (12) In the opinion of those who have admired Cleveland for his Hawaiian attitude and for the enemies he had made, his recent act is one of the most outrageous and disgraceful ever committed by a politician. (13) V. Y.

(1) I do not think it strange. I should have been more surprised, had my view of the present situation commanded general approval among radicals. That is not strange which accords, or seems to accord, with prepossessions, and, the prepossessions of radicals being overwhelmingly against war in general, it is natural rather than strange that radicals, in regard to the crisis now before us, should take the attitude least likely to result in war. In fact, I myself am driven to a different attitude only after a mental combat with my own prepossessions. Generally speaking, of all incidental conditions unfavorable to progress of peaceful social evolution, war seems to me the most obstructive and reactionary in its effects. Consequently I have to overcome this strong prejudice of mine against war, before I can give due weight to any special circumstances that may arise to make war advisable. Certainly I cannot expect that very many of those who share this excellent prejudice will be successful in so overcoming it, and I am quite prepared to see none of them triumph over it. When announcing my position, I was perfectly well aware that I was more likely to stand alone among radicals on this question than on any which I have ever discussed in these columns. The number that do or may stand with me is at present an unknown quantity. If it shall prove considerable, the fact will be surprising. On the other hand, if Mr. Yarros is right in saying that I am absolutely alone, then there is no reason to pronounce this a strange condition of things. But, assuming the fact, whether strange or not, to be as he states, what of it? Is my position overthrown thereby? I may be right, and all others wrong. Is it not so?

As to the incidental assumption that Grover Cleveland has made or will make a "preposterous and childish decision," upon England's treatment of which the question of war will hang, let me point out that Grover Cleveland neither has made or will make any decision whatever. The decision which England will be required either to accept or to reject or to submit to arbitration will be the decision of congress upon the report of the commission which it has authorized the president to appoint, and which the president has appointed, to advise congress as to the true boundary between Venezuela and British Guiana. Whatever the outcome may be, Grover Cleveland cannot control it, and will not be responsible for it. He has not decided the matter, but, as was his official duty, has laid it for decision before authorities legally constituted. If this decision should be preposterous and childish, the blame will fall, not on Grover Cleveland, but on Judge Brewer, Judge Alvey, President Gilman, ex-President White, F. R. Coudert, and the United States congress.

(2) To me it is rather refreshing than otherwise to find Mr. Yarros branding as discredited an administration for refusing to hail whose advent and to trust whose promises with the same confident enthusiasm that he manifested I was looked upon by him, less than four short years ago, as something of a marplot in Anarchistic councils, obstinately frustrating the design of reaching Anarchism by the road of politics. As I never credited this administration, with me it cannot be discredited. Neither, on the other hand, will I debit it with an offence when it takes a wise and salutary stand, though "*all* the progressive reformers," who swung their hats for it in 1892, desert it when it most deserves support.

(3) I do not know precisely what Mr. Yarros means by an industrial country. If he means a country expending its energies in production and exchange, then I answer that England and all European countries are distinctly less industrial than the United States, for they expend a great portion of their energy in maintaining the enginery of destruction, while the United States expends nearly the minimum of energy upon militant manifestation. If he means a country laying no restrictions upon production and exchange, then I answer that England, though more industrial than the United States in imposing no duties on foreign trade, is surely less industrial than the United States in restrictions of access to the land. But, be this as it may, the only criticism that I make upon the sentiment here expressed by Mr. Yarros is that it is not sufficiently characterized by Anglomania to suit my taste. I go farther than Mr. Yarros. So thoroughly do I believe that the English people are, on the whole, the freest in the world, and rivalled only by the French as leaders of civilization, that, if the change could be effected without causing an increase of militancy on this hemisphere, and if it would endow Americans with all the benefits and liberties now enjoyed by inhabitants of England, not only would I gladly see England make British colonies out of all the countries of South and Central America, but I would cheerfully see her regain possession of these United States, pending the time when nationalities shall be no more. After this statement, I hope to be relieved of all suspicion of Anglophobia, and must ask Mr. Yarros to refrain from adducing any further arguments implying that I object to English extension because it is English.

(4) It is perfectly true, from the Anarchistic standpoint, that England's title to the disputed territory is as good, and as bad, as Venezuela's. Not only do we not know to whom it really belongs, but no arbitration of the ordinary sort would determine this. Arbitration by an Anarchistic commission would speedily show that most of this debatable land is nobody's property at present, and that such parts of it as are property belong to their occupants. None of it belongs rightly to any nation, and the governments that are scrambling for it are equally thieves. But, in discussing the present crisis, I am not immediately concerned with the fundamental basis of land ownership. The sole point to be considered by Anarchists is this: of those solutions of this thieves' quarrel which stand any chance of adoption, which is likely to do least harm to Anarchism and to social reform? A question which I answer as follows: that solution which shall compel recognition of the boundary line which, after arbitration in accordance with the thieves' own rules, shall be fixed upon as that which separated Venezuela from British Guiana at the time when this country, in the interest of its peace and safety, first announced to Europe: You may keep all the territory that you have on this hemisphere, but you shall never have an inch more. Now, Liberty has not the space in which to canvass all the evidence that tends to show what this boundary line is. But I may look for a moment at the claim advanced by Mr. Yarros that England is not now trying to grab, and that there is more reason to believe that England is honest in her claim than that Venezuela is honest in hers. Setting aside for the moment our Anarchistic belief that national ownership of any territory whatever is necessarily thievery, I ask to be shown the smallest scrap of evidence that Venezuela is dishonest in her claim. She has steadily urged a submission of her claims to arbitration, and England refuses this? Which of these two attitudes, I ask, is the more indicative of honesty? Even if we admit that England's refusal does not establish her dishonesty, it is certain that Venezuela's desire to arbitrate indicates confidence in the genuineness of her case. And there is nothing to offset this indication. All the aggressiveness in this matter has been shown by England. Venezuela's claim has shown no progressive eastward tendency, but England's claim, in spite of an occasional retreating tendency, has shown, on the whole, a strongly progressive westward tendency. England has been offensive, Venezuela defensive,—another presumption in favor of Venezuela's greater honesty. Even Felix Adler, who is hardly a champion of Cleveland's attitude, had to confess that "English rule in South America is a rule of land-grabbing and aggression." But listen for a moment to what an Englishman says on this point. Mr. Yarros will not deny that Mr. Henry Labouchere is an observer dispassionate almost to cynicism,—keen, bold, outspoken, cool-headed, and exceptionally familiar with what goes on behind the political scenes. What said he in "Truth" the other day, referring to

Salisbury's repudiation of Granville's concessions to Venezuela?

Why was this fatal change of front made in that year? Gold in paying quantities, as was supposed, had been found to exist in portions of the disputed territory on our side of the Schomburgk line. As soon as it was thought that the evidence showed that paying gold existed in Matabelel, we slew the king of that country and most of his subjects and laid hold of his territories. Is it, then, to be supposed that, if we claimed land containing gold in South America, we would refer our title to arbitration and thus incur the chance of being deprived of a possible Eldorado? No. We backed out of the arbitration to which we had assented, and sat tight. It is the old story of the *auri sacra fames* (accursed greed for gold).

If this is not enough, we may turn to the remarkable change of opinion effected in the offices of the English newspapers by the facts and documents transmitted to the London "Chronicle" by Mr. Henry Norman, a famous English journalist whose writings on international questions have lifted him almost to the height of an authority, and who has been sent to the United States by the "Chronicle" especially to deal with the present crisis. Mr. Norman quotes the correspondence of 1841 between the Venezuelan minister to England and Lord Aberdeen, then the English secretary of State for foreign affairs, which ended by a submission to the Venezuelan demand for a removal of the Schomburgk posts, and during which Lord Aberdeen wrote as follows:

It appears that Mr. Robert Schomburgk planted the boundary posts at certain points in the country he surveyed, and that he was fully aware that the demarkation so made was merely a preliminary measure open to future discussion between the governments of Great Britain and Venezuela. . . . These posts afford the only tangible means by which Great Britain is prepared to discuss the boundaries. . . . They were erected for that purpose, and not, as the Venezuelan government appears to apprehend, as indications of dominion and empire on the part of Great Britain.

Now, it must be remembered that the Schomburgk line, fixed by the posts above referred to, is precisely the boundary upon which Lord Salisbury now insists as absolute and within which he refuses arbitration. In other words, up to this line and on the strength of it England now claims the very dominion and empire which in 1841 she declared not to be indicated by the placing of the posts. Does any one suppose for a moment that Lord Salisbury was ignorant of the Aberdeen attitude? But, if not, then his present claim shows him as indisputably a land-grabber.

So plain was this that the English newspapers, on reading Mr. Norman's letters, executed a prompt right-about-face. Said the "Chronicle" editorially:

The Schomburgk line is proved worthless as a basis of any territorial claim whatever. . . . Our representative's citations vitiate Lord Salisbury's second despatch to Secretary Olney, and render it necessary for us to revise our whole view of the situation. Clearly, there can now be no question regarding the Schomburgk line as a ramrod thrust between Guiana and Venezuela.

The "Pall Mall Gazette" thought the documents so conclusive that it asks why Olney did not use them to refute Salisbury. "Did he," the "Gazette" asks, "deliberately prefer to pick a quarrel with Lord Salisbury?"

Said the "St. James Gazette":

The British people are not being properly treated by the government when it is left to the enterprise of a newspaper to discover in a foreign country that unpublished official correspondence upon which peace or war may depend does not justify the statements of our foreign minister.

The "Saturday Review," which but a week before had declared most arrogantly and contemptuously that, when such "an insult is thrown across the Atlantic, it is time to put our foot down," was moved by Mr. Norman's letters to keep its foot up, declaring that Lord Salisbury must withdraw from the position which he has taken.

Even the "Thunderer" itself, which at the start laid down the law to the United States with great emphasis, now declares that "there is no particular sanctity in the Schomburgk line." Upon this the New York "Times," which, I presume, Mr. Yarros regards as belonging to the indecent portion of the press, makes the following pertinent editorial comments.

The London "Times" said on Monday that it would not "allow that anything had occurred since President Cleveland sent his Venezuelan message to congress substantially to alter the position," but it almost immediately added that "there is no particular sanctity in the Schomburgk line." . . . We can scarcely admit that nothing has occurred since the president's message substantially to alter the situation. What has happened has been the enlightenment of the British public with respect to the merits of the Venezuelan dispute, and this has been brought about by the despatches of Mr. Henry Norman, showing conclusively that the "line" which Lord Salisbury drew as the line within which he would not arbitrate had no historical validity whatsoever, had never been assented to by Venezuela, and had been waived by Great Britain. . . . Nothing could more distinctly have tended for peace than the publication of the historical facts about the Schomburgk line. That publication has created a real revulsion of British sentiment. . . . As a matter of fact, the view which the London "Times" now abandons,—to wit, that there is some "particular sanctity about the Schomburgk line,"—is the view which Lord Salisbury's despatches sedulously inculcated. It was from these despatches alone, very naturally, that most Englishmen derived their impressions of the boundary question. They may be searched in vain for any avowal of the facts that the Schomburgk line had never been made an ultimatum until Lord Salisbury made it so, and that it was a line run for the convenience of a British ministry half a century ago, and, in the language of that ministry, "merely a preliminary measure open to future discussion." All this Lord Salisbury, we will not say suppressed, but left out of view in his recent despatch reciting the history of the boundary dispute. Whoever derived his information upon the subject from that despatch would have supposed that the Schomburgk line was not only Lord Salisbury's ultimatum, but that it represented the historic and indubitable rights of Great Britain, which national self-respect would not permit her to submit to arbitration. When Englishmen found that, instead of being all this, the Schomburgk line is only what it is, and that Lord Salisbury has appeared ready to risk war in behalf of "a preliminary measure open to future discussion," the prospects for a peaceable settlement of the dispute immediately brightened.

A similar view is taken by the London correspondent of the New York "Tribune," "I. N. F.," who says:

The "Times" makes an important concession when it describes the Schomburgk line as having no particular sanctity, and as useful mainly for marking off the practically settled from the unoccupied districts. By suggesting that it ought not to be difficult to determine and exclude the districts actually occupied on either side, it opens the way for arbitration of the boundaries of the unsettled districts as a whole, without dealing with the Schomburgk line at all. The precise method proposed by the "Times" is not important; what is significant is its concession that the Schomburgk line, which was Lord Salisbury's irreducible minimum, lacks the sanctity of a fixed frontier of the British empire. That was the line which Lord Salisbury said could not be discussed; yet the leading English journal deals with it as though it were a convenient geographical expression, and argues that arbitration could be arranged without reference to it.

There have been but two answers made to Mr. Norman: first, that his facts are not new; second, that Lord Aberdeen in 1844, three years after his letter referred to above, wrote another, in which he stated that England, by removing the boundary posts, did not cede any rights which she might consider herself authorized to claim in the future. To these answers Mr. Norman convincingly rejoins that, even if his facts have been published before, they had been forgotten, or neglected, or underrated; that, whether new or old, the conclusions from them are unavoidable; and that no *ex post facto* explanations can alter the meaning of the British official statements made at the very time when the posts were removed.

I maintain that the facts and opinions above cited show indisputably that the claims now put forward by the English government are gauzy pretences made in the hope of getting possession of one of the richest gold countries in the world. England stands convicted out of her own mouth. That her foremost organs of opinion confess this is further evidence that her claim was dishonest. If I understand the temper of England, she is a nation which will fight to the end, against fearful odds, when she knows that she is right. When she knows that she is wrong, she will still fight to the end, if she feels confident of victory; but she will not continue to fight when she is wrong, if she sees defeat ahead. On this Venezuela question England has virtually backed down already. If she were in the right, she would not have backed down, though the whole world had threatened her. The fact that she has backed down is evidence that she knew that she was wrong and that she would be whipped if she should attempt to execute her purpose, and consequently was extremely delighted to be furnished by Mr. Norman with "new" facts that made the withdrawal of her claim imperative.

But none of the foregoing proof was really necessary. The very nature of the claim would justify any one familiar with England's diplomatic practices in something more than suspicion as to her sincerity in this case. That Mr. Yarros entertains no such suspicion shows that he is altogether too innocent to live in any part of the civilized world, least of all in "fly" Chicago.

(5) On this point also I appeal to English sources. Sir Edward Clarke, a Tory member of the British parliament and so eminent a lawyer that he was England's solicitor-general from 1886 to 1892, said on January 7, in a speech to his constituents at Plymouth, England, that, if Great Britain refused arbitration on her claims within the Schomburgk line, submitting to arbitration only those claims outside of that line, there would be a war with the United States, in which Great Britain would not be in the right. And on the same day Professor W. Hudson Shaw, of Oxford University, expressed himself as follows:

[Continued on page 8.]

What Might Have Been.

The trance medium has kindly given the following account of what might have been, had the Anarchists held a conference at the World's Fair.

An English delegate delivered a paper on the relation of parents to children, in which he declared that Individualists could never consistently oppose parental cruelty. The California delegates seriously objected.

Then the champion heavy-weight sprang up and declared that his Egoistic friends were right. "For," said he, "children are the product of their parents' labor. Therefore they belong to their parents. Contract rights are the only kind I keep in my office, and so I can concede no others. My supply of Natural Rights was consumed by spontaneous combustion long ago. As children cannot contract, they will have to do without rights. As they have no rights and are the property of their parents, it would be a breach of equal freedom to interfere, even if the parent chose to destroy his property."

Seven or eight delegates jumped to their feet. A torrent of questions poured over the desks and fell in a cascade on the floor. "Are children property?" shouted one. "Must we classify human beings with the lower animals?" yelled another. "Shall we talk of 'piglings' instead of 'kids'?" demanded a third. "Does Anarchism mean slavery?" asked a fourth. Several others shouted: "You're a beast!" "Heartless monster!" "Unsympathetic wretch!" Similar epithets were on every tongue.

The Kansas contingent sat bemoaning themselves in a corner, and, lifting up their voices, wailed: "Alas! alack!" This comes of departing from the extremely narrow way of the 'Arena,' of opposing an age of consent, and of disbelieving in the scheme of Jacob to obtain the best of Laban's cattle."

Here Helen D. Amnation jumped up and squeaked: "You've got him there. Pre-natal culture does the biz!"

When the hubbub subsided a little, the champion heavy-weight said: "An it please you, my lords and ladies with sons and daughters, I am a beast, a craven, a mere unsympathetic creature, but I possess reason withal. Equal freedom is my watch word, and I follow it unflinchingly. Equal freedom says a parent may kill his child, and so he may."

A still small voice murmured: "I thought you told the Foreign Missionary a few months ago that you did not follow that law when such a course would result in greater human misery." But the voice was drowned beneath the sea of questions that were flowing in from all sides.

Over the heads of the excited multitude the Foreign Missionary was brandishing a boycott. On a desk behind him the Poet Laureate was seen waving a white and green flag with a red centre, and, as he waved, he sang a song to the tune of: "I don't want to play in your yard."

When order was partially restored, the California delegation presented the following set of resolutions:

Whereas, the child at birth is the product of its parents' labor; and

Whereas, all the particles in the human body are the result of food consumed, which food is necessarily the product of labor; and

Whereas, though the particles are constantly changing, it takes about seven years for the entire human body to change in this manner,—therefore be it

Resolved, that we, as Anarchists, believe that the child at birth is the property of its parents; and be it further

Resolved, that, as long as the child contains in its body any of the particles which have been built up by the food supplied by said parents, the property right of said parents is proportionate to the ratio of the particles formed by said food to the rest of the particles in the child's body. That is to say, while the child is wholly dependent upon its parents, it is their property exclusively. When it first ceases to be dependent upon them, their property right begins to diminish, and continues to do so at such a rate as to entirely cease at the end of seven years.

The still small voice asked: "What do you mean by a partial property right? I suppose a man of thirty, who has been supported by his parents until he was twenty-four, may be compelled to go on a message against his will, because his feet still belong to his parents, but he cannot be compelled by them to deliver the message, because his mouth has by that time become his own."

How long this might have continued is uncertain. For the proceedings were here interrupted by the entrance of the Labor Union delegate, shouting: "Here is your new edition of 'Mutual Banking.' Only ten cents a copy. Twenty copies for a dollar. Walk up, ladies and gentlemen, and pay your dime to view the birth of the new era." E. D. T.

Punishment and Defence.

To the Editor of Liberty:

The continual reference to "punishment" as equivalent to "defence" in Liberty I must be permitted to protest against.

"Punishment" is not defence; "punishment" is aggression.

Punishment is essentially a counter-injury inflicted for one of three reasons: first, for revenge,—that is, to gratify the passions; secondly, to carry out threats made before an impending attack with a view of averting it; thirdly, to prevent a repetition of an offence by the invader or by others who might become invaders.

The first reason—gratification of passion—I think no one will support.

The third is invalid, because it is directed, not against a given act of invasion, but against possible future acts, which there is no reason to suppose are intended.

The second can be defended only on the ground that we must do what we say we will do simply because we have said it, which may be true in the general sense that it is important to cultivate a reputation for truthfulness; but, apart from this, the second reason falls along with the third.

Defence is that which prevents an invasion before it is committed or frustrates it before completion; but defence, after the invasion is done, is out of the question; any retaliation is aggressive.

JOHN BEVERLEY ROBINSON.

The Pulpit Ahead of the Press.

The Detroit "Evening Press" of December 23 contained the following leader:

NO ROOM FOR TWO FLAGS.

Joseph A. Labadie will expound "Anarchy" at Plymouth Tabernacle to night. Mr. Labadie is not a bomb-throwing Anarchist. He is an impractical dreamer, and lives in a little visionary world in which the men and women are too constitutionally "tired" to do wrong.

The Herr Most type of Anarchist guzzles beer and talks of bombs. Philosophic Anarchists, like Mr. Labadie, say nothing about bombs, but they defend the red flag and are really more dangerous than the Mosts. Their alleged philosophy has no real foundation. It may dazzle a few weak minds with its iridescence, but neither philosophical Anarchy, nor any other sort of Anarchy, will ever be permitted to make much progress in America. It is essentially foreign and essentially vicious. Our people are too patriotic and too practical to take much stock in it.

There is no room for two flags in the United States. The Stars and Stripes, baptized in the blood of martyrs, on a thousand battlefields, is the only flag for true Americans. Its folds are ample and its colors true. There is no desire on the part of Americans to exchange it for the banner of BLOOD, DESPAIR, AND RUIN.

Anarchism is a dangerous cult. It is much affected just now by a few of the ennuied scions of wealth in New York, but the invitation extended to Mr. Labadie to expound it in Detroit is about the first intimation the people of this city had received that there were many persons here who careu a rap about Anarchism.

If men and women wish to cultivate this poisonous mental disease, they should be forced to do so in the seclusion of their closets.

We believe in the largest personal liberty consistent with our form of government; but the line must be drawn somewhere. The public propagation of Anarchistic ideas, whether by Joseph Labadie or John Most, should not be tolerated.

Strictly speaking, the teaching of Anarchism is treason.

Men and women are not permitted to spread physical disease. Neither should they be permitted to inoculate the public with diseases of the mind. Anarchism is nothing less than madness. We are surprised, therefore, that the management of Plymouth Tabernacle should have permitted that edifice to be used in the propagation of Anarchism, either by the polished, cultured Detroit apostle of that cult or by any one else.

Anarchists are even more opposed to religion than they are to government. Liberal, indeed, must be that church which permits a leader of Anarchists to teach Anarchy from its pulpit. Plymouth Tabernacle should be draped with red bunting this evening, and life-sized pictures of living and dead Anarchists prominently displayed.

It will be seen from the following extract from the "Evening Press" of December 24 that that journal learned something over night, just as the church itself, whose example the journal followed, had learned something during the year.

Anarchy occupied the attention of the Onward club at their semi-monthly meeting at Plymouth Tabernacle last evening. About sixty members of the club sat down to a supper at eight o'clock, after which they listened to a lengthy dissertation on the principles of Anarchy by Joseph A. Labadie. About three years ago this gentleman was invited to speak on the same subject in the same place, and it became necessary to recall the invitation, the trustees of the church objecting to the expounding of such a subject within the church walls. Since then, it appears, a change of heart has been experienced by the church trustees. The lecture was listened to very intently and well received.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight, and to notify the secretary promptly in case of any failure to write to a target (which it is hoped will not often occur), or in case of temporary or permanent withdrawal from the work of the Corps. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity of informing the secretary of suitable targets. Address, STEPHEN T. BYINGTON, Flushing Institute, Flushing, N. Y.

Target, section A.—Judson Starr, Peoria, Ill., spoke on Anarchy at the meeting of the State Bar Association a year ago. He said:

I think the lesson of the hour is against secession, and that Anarchy represents it; secession of a wider, deeper significance than any of our forefathers knew; secession, not of a State from other States nor from the union, but from the social compact itself; secession from the recognized forms of law institutions and functions of State. Certainly the subject presents no notion of union, no notion of order, no notion of government, and it may be some surprise to you, as it was to me, to know that the leading advocate of Anarchy in France, Proudhon, insisted upon a union,—a union of order and Anarchy,—a union compared with which the union between Ireland and England has been a mere cock-fight.

That may be very angelic in theory. Angels may not need legislation, but men, as we know them, certainly do. Anarchy, as we know, arraigns itself against the three citadels of our commerce,—first, our land commerce, second, our inter-state commerce, and, third, our centres of commerce. By land commerce I mean the right of property in land. By inter-state commerce I mean the free interchange of products of the field and farm, of the mine and factory, for trade and gain. By centres of commerce I mean the great resultants of these—our large cities and centres of trade. The Anarchist insists that all property is theft, because it assumes to hold the labor of others without an equivalent; that there should be no such thing as trade and gain; that competition may be the life of trade, but that it is the death of men; that all wage service is mere slavery; that the hod-carrier should receive just as much as the mason, and the contractor no more than either; that the expert engineer should receive no more than the raw brakeman, and the railway manager no more than either. . . .

I do not believe the attack on these three citadels will result in their overthrow. The danger is this,—that men, fearing for their lives, fearing for their property and security, fearing for what civilization secures for them, will be willing to put all that they have got into the control of a larger power, of a central power; that in the face of these dangers they will take refuge in a stronger government. Then my fear is that this government itself will become arbitrary, and it will be necessary again to reform the sovereign government to protect the people from the encroachment of that arbitrary power. The Anarchist must to

be feared, in my judgment, is not the Anarchist Most or the Anarchist Mowbray, but is the anarchist in every man's heart that, in the presence of arbitrary power, rages like a very devil.

A member of Section B has lately written to Mr. Starr with reference to these words. In reply, Mr. Starr calls special attention to the last sentence quoted, repeating it and saying: "I believe just that and all it implies"; says he got his knowledge of Proudhon from the Encyclopædia Britannica; and closes by saying: "My address was not written, and, though it has been much inquired after, I have not written it, as I am keeping up a deal of thinking on the very lines suggested by your letter, and reserve the right to say what I think in the best light that may come to me. The conclusions I draw must be separated from the doctrines stated by others, for they are my own and do not depend on reading so much as on observation. Would be glad to hear more from you."

Point out his errors about Anarchism; explain the harmony of true Anarchism with order.

Section B.—"Commercial Gazette," Cincinnati, O., published a letter from Walter H. Beecher taking the ground that no real rights are involved in the Venezuela muddle,—that the governments are being used to help monopolistic land-grabbers. The paper prints radical letters, and keeps standing this notice to writers:

Limit your complaints to four hundred words, write on one side of the paper, omit libelous and false statements, and enclose your name and address for reference—not for publication. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

Drive home the point that the people of the disputed territory are to have no rights, whichever wins.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

State Railway Management.

To the Editor of Liberty:

As a number of American and British Socialistic papers are urging the nationalization of railways, on the ground that so excellent results have attended government ownership in other countries, I would like to say that, while the Belgian and Hungarian State railways are conducted in an enlightened manner (as are also some privately-owned lines, notably the Tilbury & Southend Railway in England), in the Australian colonies the reverse is the case. The fares and freights there are extravagantly high, passengers being charged four cents a mile second and six cents first class, while, to avoid the cost of sending goods by rail, shippers will often forward them hundreds of miles by teams. The accommodation, too, is generally shocking; indeed, up to five years ago, when a new manager was brought out from England, the New South Wales railways ran the old windowless cars which were given up in England forty years ago, and the engines were of the most antiquated patterns. The governments, too, instead of retaining the leads through which new lines are to run for the benefit of their clients, as do private lines, sell them at their unimproved value previous to construction, so that a few rich men in the secret get all the cream. There is still no connection between the railways and the wharves in Sidney, though a line through the city has been projected for over twenty years.

EVACUSTES A. PHIPSON.

Law and Missions in Florida.

[American Missionary.]

When the time came to open the Orange Park School, Superintendent Sheats printed several threatening manifestoes that, in case white teachers should room in the same building with colored pupils, they would be immediately arrested. Or, if white teachers should eat their daily food in the same room with colored pupils, then, again, they would be made to feel the majesty of this enactment. Once more, if any white pupil should be taught in the same class, or room, or building, by the same teacher at the same time, the terrors of this act would be at once visited upon him. Also, above his own name, he proclaimed that he would prevent the carrying on of the Orange Park School as it had been conducted, law or no law, even if the supreme court of the United States should pronounce against the constitutionality of this enactment.

Nevertheless, the American Missionary Association began its school with white teachers and colored pupils living in the same building, and awaited arrests. No arrests came, though the sheriff was present ready, and very ready, to make them. The superintendent, who a few days previous was intent to see what would happen, did not see anything. Mother Goose tells us of one who was so wondrous wise that he jumped into a bramble bush and scratched out both his eyes. There may be brambles in Florida.

Next, the Association placed the "white teachers and colored pupils in the same dining-room at the same time," and awaited arrests for this "crime." No arrests came. When patience ceased to be a virtue, instructions were given to conduct the school in the ways of righteousness, exactly as before the Florida legislature voted that this is "crime." Now the white and colored pupils are in the same classes at the same time and place.

[The above brings up to date the history of a case referred to in Mr. Byington's recent article on "Governments and Christian Missions." Passive resistance seems to prosper in Florida. —EDITOR LIBERTY.]

A Characteristic Criticism.

[George E. Macdonald in the Truth Seeker.]

"To my comrade," is the inscription I discover written over my name in a neat volume of poems entitled "Wind-Harp Songs," by J. William Lloyd, which the author has sent me. I accept the word comrade. It is preferable to "brother," as it contains no suggestion of church-membership and has no cant about it. For allied reasons, songs stand higher in my estimation than hymns. While I have to admire some of the poems in this volume without being clear as to their purpose or the significance of their form, those which I am equal to grasping are so excellent that I have no doubt the fault is my own that the others are not read understandingly. Mr. Lloyd is not a poet of thought, but of impression and fancy. I should say that he has more sensibility than perceptibility. Phenomena are more felt than seen. Their light and shadow fall upon him, and he makes random notes. In the same manner I quote:

Banks,
Bees,
Bird music,
Clouds,
Distance, . . .

Sleep.

You see, the theme is not worked out. Now, Banks are low, or they are high—Grassy or bare, and the bees hum by. Music of birds is sad or gay, Or low and sweet; clouds drift away. While distance ends in widest blue, Sleep draws her curtain o'er the view. And so on; but Mr. Lloyd omits these collateral facts. He gives the outline, and lets you fill in the colors. If the picture isn't satisfactory, that is the fault of your imagination or your execution, and you can't blame him. His list of substantives is above criticism.

Passing by these eccentricities, no one can deny to Mr. Lloyd the qualities of a true poet. He has great sympathy, great sensitiveness, and a wonderful delicacy of touch. Those who have been, as he has, "on the plains, in the forest, in the wake of the plough," will in these poems hear again the music that haunts the silence of those places, and which they may have forgotten or thought upon as a lost chord.

After All, Crops Do Depend on Politics.

[George E. Macdonald in Truth Seeker.]

I suppose that few of the people of Kansas know how much they are indebted to the Boston "Arena" for its successful agitation in favor of raising the age of protection for girls in that State. The following anecdote bearing on the matter is told in Washington city by Representative Mercer of Nebraska: An old Kansas couple who had a son living in California wrote to him requesting that he should return and take up his abode with them during the remainder of their declining years. The son was dutiful, but he preferred California for ranching, and so, according to Representative Mercer, he replied: "I am surprised at your asking me to return. I own a ranch here, and am happy. If anything is lacking, it is you. I would dearly love to be with you again, but, as I said before, I am surprised that you should ask me to return to a State where they raised nothing at all last year except the age of consent." It will be gratifying to Mrs. Gardener and Mr. Flower to learn that they have saved the Sunflower State from the reproach of total infertility.

Rather the Criminal than his Lawyer.

"What do you think of the practice of criminal law as a specialty?" asked a Yale student of his instructor, the Hon. Edward J. Phelps, formerly minister to the court of St. James.

"I would rather practise crime," was the ready answer. "It is just as respectable and far more lucrative."

The Nature of Wealth.

[John Ruskin.]

The art of becoming "rich," in the common sense, is not absolutely nor finally the art of accumulating much money for ourselves, but also of contriving that our neighbors shall have less. In accurate terms, it is "the art of establishing the maximum of inequality in our own favor." The circulation of wealth in a nation resembles that of the blood in the natural body. There is one quickness of the current which comes of cheerful emotion or healthy exercise, and another which comes of shame or of fever. There is a flush of the body which is full of warmth and life, and another which will pass into putrefaction. It is impossible to conclude, of any given mass of acquired wealth, merely by the fact of its existence, whether it signifies good or evil to the nation in the midst of which it exists. Its real value depends on the moral sign attached to it, just as sternly as that of a mathematical quantity depends on the algebraical sign attached to it. Any given accumulation of commercial wealth may be indicative, on the one hand, of faithful industries, progressive energies, and productive ingenuities, or, on the other, it may be indicative of mortal luxury, merciless tyranny, ruinous chicane. Some treasures are heavy with human tears, as an ill-stored harvest with untimely rain; and some gold is brighter in sunshine than it is in substance.

And these are not, observe, merely moral or pathetic attributes of riches, which the seeker of riches may, if he chooses, despise; they are, literally and sternly, material attributes of riches, depreciating or exalting, incalculably, the monetary significance of the sum in question. One mass of money is the outcome of action which has created—another of action which has annihilated—ten times as much in the gathering of it; such and such strong hands have been paralyzed, as if they had been numbed by night-shade; so many strong men's courage broken, so many productive operations hindered; this and the other false direction given to labor, and lying image of prosperity set up, on Dura plains dug into seven-times-heated furnaces. That which seems to be wealth may in verity be only the gilded index of far-reaching ruin; a wrecker's handful of coin gleaned from the beach to which he has beguiled an argosy; a camp-follower's bundle of rags unwrapped from the breasts of goodly soldiers dead; the purchase-pieces of potter's fields, wherein shall be buried together the citizen and the stranger. Charcoal may be cheap among your roof-timbers after a fire, and bricks may be cheap in your streets after an earthquake; but fire and earthquake may not, therefore, be national benefits.

Paragraphs from Meredith.

And if we have the world for the buttress of injustice, then is nature the flaring rebel; there is no fixed order possible. Laws are necessary instruments of the majority; but, when they grind the same human being to dust for their maintenance, their enthronement is the rule of the savage's old deity, sniffing blood-sacrifice. There cannot be a based society upon such conditions. An immolation of the naturally-constituted individual arrests the general expansion to which we step, decivilizes more, and is more impious to the God in man, than temporary revelries of a license that nature soon checks.

Ideas, new-born and naked original ideas, are acceptable at no time to the humanity they visit to help uplift it from the state of beast.

Against her was the livid cloud-bank over a flowery field, that has not yet spoken audible thunder: the ter-

sible aggregate social woman, of man's creation, hated by him, dreaded, scorned, satirized, and, nevertheless, upheld, esteemed, applauded; a mark of civilization, on to which our human society must hold as long as we have nothing humaner. She exhibits virtue, with face of waxen angel, with paw of desert beast, and blood of victims on it. Her fold is a genial clime e, and the material pleasures for the world's sheepy: worshipping herself, she claims the sanctification of a performed religion. . . . She loves nothing. Undoubtedly, she dislikes the vicious. On that merit she subsists.

Hysteria or Sanity?

[Continued from page 5.]

The universal opinion at first was that President Cleveland's message was sent out for political purposes. Now we believe that the British government was wrong and drew down President Cleveland's anger justly. We also think that perhaps his letter could have been couched in more diplomatic language. But we accept the justice of Mr. Cleveland's claim. Lord Salisbury's action in refusing arbitration is regarded as a political blunder and, I may say, crime by many right-thinking Englishmen.

(6) If this could be accepted as an excuse at all, it could serve to excuse only a refusal to entertain arbitration in any matter whatsoever. It certainly is no defence for a government which offers to submit one section of a disputed territory to arbitration, but declines to so submit the remaining section. (Let me say, in passing, that I am not an enthusiastic believer in international arbitration, and should not be, even were it accepted and established; my reasons I may develop at some other time.)

(7) No more and no less dictatorial than the Monroe doctrine itself. That doctrine is a dictatorial, but entirely justifiable, decree, "Thus far, and no farther!" based on the *might* of the United States, which proposes, if necessary, to use its might now, in order to avoid the necessity of having to maintain a costly and permanent show of its might hereafter. If Professor Woolsey is the greatest American writer on international law, he is no more to be respected on that account than if he were the greatest American writer on God or any other spook. International law is nothing but the unwritten code of a pack of thieves to protect each in his plunder.

(8) The progressive elements will not disapprove a necessary war simply because the declaration of such a war is made in order to serve personal ends. If Cleveland has taken the right course,—and I think that he has in the main,—I shall not oppose that course because he is "playing politics." What his motives are he alone knows. Mr. Yarros does not know, and I do not know. Professor Shaw, quoted above, believes that the president is sincere. So does Mr. Norman. And I certainly fail to see why Mr. Yarros should pronounce Cleveland an artful intriguer when he is so confident that Salisbury is a creature free from guile.

(9) Mr. Yarros cannot hope to convince me by the use of adjectives. If he says that my view is grotesquely absurd, I shall simply say the same of his, and we shall be quits. My view was concisely expressed in the senate some days ago by Henry Cabot Lodge. I give it below in his words:

> If England can seize territory under a claim which has grown larger with each succeeding year, there is nothing to prevent her taking indefinite regions in South America. If England can do it, and is allowed to do it by the United States, every other European power can do the same, and they will not be slow to follow England's example. We have seen them parcel out Africa, and, if we do not interpose now in this case, the fate of large portions of South America will be the same. We shall have formidable rivals all about, we shall be in constant danger of war, and shall be forced to become a military power with great armies and navies.

If this is absurd, it seems to me that Mr. Yarros should be able to exhibit the absurdity by analysis. To me it seems perfectly plain and rational.

I dispute the statement that "whether a given step is a menace or not is a question of fact," if Mr. Yarros means by it, for instance, that, if England gains her point, it is a question of fact whether one result, or another, will ensue. I say that this is a question of opinion. But my opinion upon it is a very strong and decided one.

(10) If there is any "idiocy" here, it is with Mr. Yarros. Existing European holdings on this hemisphere are not sufficient in extent, or in the number of powers represented, to endanger our peace and safety. They would still be insufficient, if England were to gain the Venezuelan territory which she claims. The whole danger lies in the liability of these holdings to increase indefinitely, if a precedent shall be established. The case of Canada is not such a precedent, because the holding was acquired before the Monroe doctrine was announced. If it shall be ascertained that the Venezuelan land which England claims was properly hers before the promulgation of the Monroe doctrine, then the awarding of this land to her now will not be such a precedent. But, if England, failing to prove an ancient title, is still allowed to take this land, then such a precedent will have been established, and it will mean an abandonment of the Monroe doctrine with all the consequences thereof. It is not becoming in a man who cannot appreciate this distinction to talk of other men as idiots.

(11) Woe is me! After Flower, Yarros! The former pronounced me irresponsible months ago; now the latter echoes the charge. Well, in my reply to Flower I characterized persons who call me irresponsible, and I have no need to repeat my words.

As long as England showed any disposition to let the *status quo* remain, the United States refrained from interference. It is only because England has begun to press her claims in an insistent manner that the United States has been forced to warn her off. Mr. Yarros seems to forget that Lord Salisbury has presented to Venezuela an ultimatum, which expires in February. If, when February arrives, England does not try to enforce this ultimatum,—and she probably will not,—it will be because she has been made aware of the danger of such a proceeding. That a degree of militarism is certain to arise from this unfortunate state of things I pointed out in my previous article; but the blame for this falls upon England, not upon the United States.

(12) This is delicious. The clear leader of the anti-Cleveland campaign, recognized as such the world over, is the New York "World." And this infamous sheet, which is loathed by most decent men, is placed by Mr. Yarros among "the decent portion of the press"! At the heels of the "World" comes the "Evening Post," which Mr. Yarros has frequently lashed in these columns, more than once charging it with the most contemptible dishonesty. Yet Godkin, no less than Pulitzer, has now become decent in his eyes. And who are the other peace-at-any-price men whom, with these, he holds up as examples? Why, there's Henry George, whom war shocks terribly, but who complacently approves the murder of Anarchists for expressing their opinions; and there's Dr. Lyman Abbott, a presumptuous parson whose trade it is to prate of peace, and a dabbler in sociology who, in a recent lecture on Anarchism, showed an ignorance of the subject which almost parallels that of Francis A. Walker; and there's President Eliot, whose opinion on this matter is not to be taken before mine, unless the writing of a chemical text-book and the inducing of sundry millionaires to bequeath large sums to Harvard peculiarly qualify a man to decide whether or not it is wise to permit burglars to surround one's house, and whose intrinsic merits do not entitle him to mention with the names of ex-President White and President Gilman; and there's Professor Woolsey, who is no "bigger" than old Brewer, with Alvey and Coudert thrown in; and there's Ernest H. Crosby, an excellent man, but a non-resistant, and therefore the last person to be cited by Mr. Yarros in this connection; and, last of all, there are the members of the Boston Free Trade League, who are of about the same importance as the inflated persons composing what the Goo-Goos call the New York "chambah of twade." Mr. Yarros will do well to straightway abandon the idea that those of his way of thinking have a "corner" in high morality. On both sides of this question there are good and bad papers, and good and bad men. And, if Mr. Yarros should point out that I find myself to some extent sharing the view of that object of my special hatred, the New York "Sun," I should answer him, first, that I have made no claim, as he has, that decency is on one side of this question and indecency on the other, and, second, that, if (borrowing the wit of a New York lawyer) I must choose between the "Sun" and the "Evening Post," one of which makes vice attractive in the morning and the other of which makes virtue hideous in the evening, I prefer to be arrayed with the former.

(13) Well, I am one of those who approve Cleveland's Hawaiian attitude and the firmness which he has often shown, and I do not regard his Venezuelan policy as outrageous and disgraceful. On the contrary, I think it will stand in future as the most notable and creditable feature of his career. And those who carefully watch public opinion see clearly that the criticism of his course is changing in character and dwindling away. At first we were told that the whole matter was a great piece of impudence, and that the quarrel between England and Venezuela is none of our concern. But we hear no more of that, except from the hysterical "Evening Post." Even the "chambah of twade," after all its bluster, now confines itself to a condemnation of Cleveland's tone. Nearly all the opponents of the president now have to admit that he is right, but they declare that he ought to have expressed himself more diplomatically. Now, that is precisely what he ought not to have done. It was his "tone" that brought England to a standstill, and to words less ringing and determined she would have paid no heed.

T.